

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 5, 57 and 59 are considered in the Office Action.

Claims 1, 5, 57 and 59 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Joe LoCicero and Donald E. Thomas, “A Multithreaded Multiple-Language Hardware/Software Cosimulator,” Carnegie Mellon University, Research Report No. CMUCAD-97-34, 1997 (“LoCicero”)

Reply

Applicants have amended claim 1, 5, 57 and 59 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. In particular, amended claims 1 and 59 recite methods for providing a design test bench, the methods including providing a single executable program adapted to create a primary thread and one or more secondary threads, the primary thread running VERILOG code on a VERILOG simulator, each of the secondary threads running a corresponding interpreter that interprets an associated scripted routine, each scripted routine comprising an associated user-defined call that is mapped to a VERILOG task; providing a plurality of user-defined VERILOG functions, each user-defined function associated with a corresponding interpreter; upon encountering one of the user-defined functions, passing control from the VERILOG simulator to the corresponding interpreter to interpret the associated scripted routine; and upon encountering one of the user-defined calls, passing control from the interpreter to the VERILOG simulator.

LoCicero does not describe or suggest the claimed invention. Instead, LoCicero describes a “cosimulator” environment in which VERILOG code is converted to “an internal, stylized form of C++,” and then the converted code is compiled and linked with C++ functions to form a completed simulation environment. (Page 6; FIG. 1).

Thus, unlike the claimed invention, LoCicero does not describe methods that provide a single executable program adapted to create a primary thread and one or more secondary threads, the primary thread running VERILOG code on a VERILOG simulator. Instead, LoCicero’s system effectively implements its own unique (non-

VERILOG) simulator that runs C++ code. In this regard, LoCicero actually points away from the claimed invention.

Because LoCicero does not describe the claimed invention, and actually points away from the claimed invention, applicants respectfully request that the § 102(b) rejections of claims 1 and 59 be withdrawn. Because claims 5 and 57 depend from claim 1, applicants further respectfully request that the § 102(b) rejections of claims 5 and 57 be withdrawn

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, applicants submit that this application, including claims 1, 5, 57 and 59, is allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner allow this application.

Respectfully submitted,



James Trosino
Registration No. 39,862
Attorney for Applicants